Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-F202-2 Short Proposal Title: Passivation Technology-Copper

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. This is a good proposal which will hopefully result in guidelines for remediation of mines nationwide.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. Underlying basis is clear – extensive lab test work, which has been successful, on this technology.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. The approach involves on-site pilot tests, sample collection and monitoring, and long-term weathering tests – all critical components in meeting project objectives.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. This site has been chosen based on ecological sensitivity, easy access, etc. Also see response to question 3 on next page.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making? Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes – the outcome is to establish guidelines for remediation in other abandoned/inactive mine sites in California.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. Workplan is outlined in the proposal – includes significant detail.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Workplan is well done, thorough and detailed. Easy to follow the project plan.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. Extensive lab work has been already done to determine feasibility of this technology.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes. University of Nevada has a good reputation in the field of acid rock drainage work.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The proposal does not address whether the success of this technology is dependent on the nature of the host rock – an important consideration.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating		Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
X 	Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor	[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]